Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Yes, recently a survey also has been sanctioned.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—Is the question of giving railway connection to any part of the Tumkur District under consideration ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Not at present.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—In that case, why should the levy of the cess continue any longer ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—The collections may be utilized for road works, etc., under the District Board Act.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—What is the harm in abolishing the railway cess altogether ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—That is a different matter.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—At least for the time being, in view of the economic position of the general tax-payer, why should not the Government think of suspending the levy ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—That is a question for consideration. But the Act permits of this amount being utilized for the improvement of roads and other communications.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the Tumkur District Board has submitted resolutions asking for the abolition of this cess ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Not to my knowledge.

Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.—When did the Government decide that no railway programmes need be undertaken in the Tumkur District ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—All I said was that there was no railway expansion in view in the Tumkur District at present.

Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.—For how many years past is the railway cess being collected there ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—For quite a number of years.

Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.—In view of the fact that no railway expansion is in view, what is the objection to discontinuing the levy of the cess ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—I do not think Government can give up the programme of improving the communications in such a summary way.

Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.—In that case, will the Government permit the district board to utilize the cess income for any other important purpose ?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Yes, it is being done already for road works. Quite recently, a sum of Rs. 25,000 or so has been sanctioned for a certain work in that district.

Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.—What is the total income from railway cess and the total expenditure incurred as against that ?

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—If the district boards themselves will consider the question of utilization of the cess income and submit resolutions to Government in consonance with the provisions of the Act, Government will be prepared to consider their suggestions favourably.

Reconstruction of the Gundarlahalli Tank in Pavagada Taluk.

Q.—25. Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY, Pavagada Taluk.—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of petitions received from the raiyats of Gundarlahalli and the neighbouring villages in Pavagada Taluk praying for the reconstruction of the old tank at Gundarlahalli ;

(*b*) whether it has come to their notice that the tank, if restored, will be useful to the raiyats of the surrounding 4 to 5 villages ;

(*c*) whether it has come to their notice that the raiyats are agreeable to pay contributions ;

(*d*) the further steps that have been taken in the matter ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Diwan Bahadur N. N. Ayyangar).—

(*a*) One petition to Government during March 1938 from Mr. Dasi Rangappa and others is forthcoming.

(*b*) The village that will be directly benefited is Gundarlahalli.

(*c*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*d*) A project amounting to Rs. 24,000 has been prepared and the question of execution of *mutchalikas* by the raiyats is taken up in the Revenue Department.

Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY.—With reference to answer to (*b*), is it not a fact that it was agreed at the time the survey was made that not merely Gundarlahalli Village but 4 or 5 surrounding villages also would benefit if this work was taken up?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—That conclusion must have been arrived at in view of the *talapariges* in existence at those places.

Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY.—Also in view of the channels proposed to be dug from the tank after it was reconstructed?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—We shall consider that question.

Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY.—What will be the acreage contribution which the raiyats are expected to make?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—They will have to pay Rs. 175 if the return to Government must be not less than 4 per cent.

Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY.—In view of the fact that the raiyats have already agreed to pay an acreage contribution of Rs. 60 and that the value of the land itself in that area does not come up to Rs. 175 an acre, will the Government see the reasonableness of charging only at Rs. 60?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—I am afraid that will not yield any return to the Government.

Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY.—Will the Government be pleased to take up the execution of the project very early?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Government are aware that this is a necessary work.

Mr. T. V. NARASINGAPPA.—The raiyats will have mentioned the contribution they are prepared to pay in the very first petition submitted by them asking for the restoration of a given tank. In this view, where is the necessity for taking *mutchalikas* from each of them?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—*Mutchalikas* are necessary because petitions are not binding.

Mr. T. V. NARASINGAPPA.—Has it come to the notice of Government that tank restoration works have been carried out by the department without consulting the raiyats in advance and even without obtaining *mutchalikas* from them? If there are such cases, how are the Government justified in compelling the raiyats to pay contribution?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I do not think there are such cases. Even if there be one or two, I may assure the member that that is certainly not the usual procedure.

Mr. T. V. NARASINGAPPA.—If such cases are brought to notice, will the Government be pleased to remit any contributions compulsorily recovered from the raiyats?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I am afraid I cannot agree to that. When a tank has been restored, it is the duty of the raiyats concerned to pay their share of the cost.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO remarked at the outset that even though the budget before the House claimed to be a surplus budget, he could not agree that it was so in the true sense of the term. Because, in addition to having included the part remission of Rs. 5·39 lakhs of the subsidy in the regular receipts, the Government had also provided a sum of Rs. 2·80 lakhs from "Other Heads." This showed as a matter of fact a deficit of at least Rs. 8 lakhs. The actuals for the year 1936-37 showed that for the first time in its history the State derived a revenue of Rs. 4 crores. But the figure of normal income was only Rs. 3·86 crores as against which the normal expenditure was Rs. 3·88 crores. In other words, the two sides of the budget did not balance each other. This was an additional reason why he said that it was a deficit budget. Nor was the speaker satisfied from the point of view of non-tax